THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

W.P.No.28178 of 2005

Date:02.01.2006

Between:

P.Subba Reddy and others

-------PETITIONERS

AND

The Government of A.P. and others

---------RESPONDENTS

ORDER:

The petitioners were appointed on contractual basis as Attenders in Sri Mahanandeeswaraswamyvari Devasthanam, Mahanandi, the third respondent herein, on the basis of the permission accorded by the then Commissioner of Endowments on 28.04.2005.

Fairly, good number of appointments, promotions, up-gradations etc., made during the tenure of the then Commissioner of Endowments, were reviewed by the Government of A.P. in exercise of the power under Section 93 of A.P. Charitable & Hindu Religious Institutions and Endowments Act. Through a common order in G.O.Ms.No.1422, Revenue (Endts.I) Department dated 25.07.2005, all such orders were set aside. In a Batch of writ petitions, this Court took the view that before such cancellation, the Government is under obligation to issue notices to the affected parties. Accordingly, the writ petitions were disposed of directing the Government to issue notices and pass appropriate orders. The petitioners herein filed W.P.No.20036 of 2005 and it was disposed of on 12.09.2005 with similar directions.

In pursuance of the orders passed by this Court, the first respondent passed orders

in G.O.Rt.No.2537, dated 17.12.2005, setting aside the orders of appointment of the petitioners. The same is challenged in this writ petition on several grounds.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners, the learned Government Pleader for Endowments and the learned standing counsel for Devasthanam.

Identical matter in relation to Sri Lakshmi Narasimha Swamivari Devasthanam, Yadagirigutta, was dealt with by this Court in W.P.No.24371 of 2005 and in respect of Srikalahastheeswara Swamy Devasthanam in W.P.No.24576 of 2005. In both the writ petitions, corresponding orders passed by the Government setting aside the orders of appointments were up-held. In the second matter, an observation was made to the effect that in case Devasthanam undertakes fresh appointments, the case of the petitioner therein shall also be considered.

Following the same, the writ petition is dismissed upholding the order passed by the first respondent in G.O.Rt.No.2537 dated 17.12.2005. It is, however, observed that in case Devasthanam intends to appoint any individuals as Attenders, the case of the petitioners also be considered on their own merits. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

02.01.2006

kdl